



UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM — MINORITY STAFF
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION
MARCH 2004

**THOUSANDS OF JOBLESS WORKERS IN THE
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METRO AREA
ARE LOSING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS**

PREPARED FOR

**REP. HENRY A. WAXMAN
REP. BRAD SHERMAN
REP. HOWARD L. BERMAN
REP. ADAM B. SCHIFF
REP. XAVIER BECERRA
REP. HILDA L. SOLIS
REP. DIANE E. WATSON
REP. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD
REP. MAXINE WATERS
REP. JANE HARMAN
REP. JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD
REP. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO
REP. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
I. Background.....	2
II. Objective and Methodology.....	4
II. Findings.....	4
A. Unemployment in the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metro Area	4
B. The Impact of the Expiration of Unemployment Insurance Benefits in the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metro Area	5
C. Lost Economic Stimulus in the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metro Area from the Failure to Extend Unemployment Benefits.....	5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The U.S. economy has been marked by over two years of near-constant job losses. Since January 2001, the economy has lost almost three million private-sector jobs. Nationally, the unemployment rate reached an eight-year high of 6.4% in June 2003. Although the unemployment rate has decreased slightly over the last several months, the total number of unemployed workers, the number of long-term unemployed, and the number of workers exhausting unemployment benefits are well above their levels at the end of 2000. And from December 2003 to February 2004, hundreds of thousands of discouraged workers dropped out of the labor market.

Traditionally, the federal-state unemployment insurance program has provided a safety net for unemployed workers during economic downturns and in the early stages of economic recoveries. In most states, benefits are paid for a maximum of 26 weeks. However, during economic recessions or periods of high unemployment, the federal government has historically extended unemployment benefits on a temporary basis to ensure that workers who are unable to find a job do not lose all benefits.

The current benefits extension, which provided 13 additional weeks of unemployment insurance for most workers, expired on December 31, 2003. These benefits cannot be extended without new legislation. Because of the failure of Congress to extend these benefits, over one million jobless workers lost their unemployment insurance in the first three months of 2004. Even so, and despite support for an extension from Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, the Bush Administration has not pushed for an extension, and Republican leaders in the House have actively opposed an extension. Thus, the prospects for any extension of unemployment benefits are slim.

At the request of the congressional representatives of the Los Angeles area, this analysis estimates (1) the number of unemployed workers in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area who lost their benefits since the expiration of the unemployment insurance extension on December 31, and (2) how many are likely to have lost their benefits by the end of June. It finds that approximately 46,700 workers in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area exhausted their benefits in the first three months of 2004. It also finds that in the first six months of 2004, an estimated 83,100 workers in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area are likely to lose their benefits if congressional inaction continues. The failure to extend benefits will result in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area losing an economic stimulus of up to \$472 million.

BACKGROUND

The federal-state unemployment insurance program is designed to provide benefits to eligible workers who are unemployed. In most states, benefits are paid for a maximum of 26 weeks. However, during economic recessions or periods of high unemployment, the federal government has historically extended unemployment benefits on a temporary basis to ensure that workers who are unable to find a job do not lose all benefits. In fact, Congress has provided for an extension of unemployment insurance during every recession since 1958. After the 1991 recession, for example, benefits were extended for 27 months, from November 1991 through February 1994.¹

In March 2002, in response to the ongoing economic slowdown, Congress passed the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (TEUC). The legislation gave an additional 13 to 26 weeks of 100% federally financed unemployment benefits for workers in states that were hit hard by the economic downturn. This extension was designed to help working Americans who were unemployed and unable to find a job. In addition to helping unemployed workers, the benefits were intended to provide a stimulus to economies in the affected states.

Unemployment benefits under the TEUC program ended on December 28, 2002. After allowing the program to expire, Congress reversed itself in January 2003 and extended unemployment benefits.² The legislation provided an additional 13 weeks of unemployment insurance for most workers.³ Unemployment benefits were extended again in May 2003 but they expired in the last week in December.⁴

Although the national unemployment rate has dropped from the June 2003 peak of 6.4%, the employment situation has shown little overall improvement. Employment conditions are presently worse than they were in March 2002, when unemployment benefits were initially extended. Relative to March 2002, the unemployment rate has remained the same, the total number of jobs has declined

¹ Congressional Research Service, *Temporary Programs to Extend Unemployment Compensation* (Jan. 24, 2003).

² Public Law 108-1.

³ For workers in defined “high unemployment” states, the legislation provided for 26-week extensions. These states were Alaska, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Washington. Department of Labor, *TEUC Trigger Notice* (May 11, 2003) (online at www.workforcesecurity.doleta.gov/unemploy/teuc/teuc69.html).

⁴ Public Law 108-26.

by more than 400,000,⁵ and the number of long-term unemployed workers has increased by 46%.⁶ While the unemployment rate remained at 5.6% in February 2004, the economy created only 21,000 new jobs and the private sector actually lost jobs.⁷

Despite the lack of significant improvement in the employment situation, Congress allowed the TEUC program to expire. Republican leaders have opposed an extension of the program, and the Bush Administration has not pushed for an extension.⁸

House Democrats on February 4, 2004, were able to obtain a vote on the House floor that authorized funding an unemployment benefits extension through the Community Development Block Grant program.⁹ However, analysts indicated that the vote was “largely symbolic” because in order to actually extend benefits, the Senate would have to approve the measure and funds would have to be appropriated for it.¹⁰ Moreover, House Majority Leader Tom DeLay has indicated that the amendment would be stripped from the legislation before final passage.¹¹ On March 11, 2004, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan testified before a House committee that he believed Congress should consider another extension of benefits,¹² but still there has been no indication from Congressional leaders that they will call forward an extension bill.

⁵ There were 109,034,000 private sector jobs in March 2002 compared to 108,594,000 in February 2004. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Unemployment Data* (2004).

⁶ There were 1.3 million long-term (more than 27 weeks) unemployed workers in March 2002 compared to 1.9 million in February 2004. *Id.*

⁷ The 21,000 new jobs created in February 2004 were all state and local government positions. *Id.*

⁸ *DeLay Says House Will Not Take up Unemployment Benefits*, Congress Daily (Dec. 8, 2003); *Snow Unsure of Benefit Extension*, Reuters (Dec. 5, 2003).

⁹ H.R. 3030, *To Amend the Community Service Block Grant Act to Provide for Quality Improvements*, Roll Call Vote No. 18 (Feb. 4, 2004). One hundred and eighty-seven Democrats voted for the amendment, with none voting against it. Thirty-nine Republicans voted for the amendment, with 179 voting against it.

¹⁰ *House Backs Extended Jobless Benefits*, Washington Post (Feb. 5, 2004).

¹¹ *House OK's Amendment to Extend Unemployment Benefits*, Congress Daily (Feb. 5, 2003).

¹² Testimony of Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, House Committee on Education and the Workforce, *Hearing on "The Changing Nature of the Economy: The Critical Roles of Education and Innovation in Creating Jobs & Opportunity in a Knowledge Economy"* (Mar. 11, 2004).

A continued failure by Congress to pass legislation to help unemployed Americans would terminate the benefits of millions of unemployed workers. In the first three months of 2004, more than one million unemployed workers lost benefits.¹³ And by July 1, 2004, almost two million additional workers will have lost benefits if Congress does not act to extend the TEUC program.¹⁴

OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY

Reps. Henry A. Waxman, Brad Sherman, Howard L. Berman, Adam B. Schiff, Xavier Becerra, Hilda L. Solis, Diane E. Watson, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Rep. Maxine Waters, Jane Harman, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Grace F. Napolitano, Linda T. Sánchez represent California's 30th, 27th, 28th, 29th, 31st, 32nd, 33rd, 34th, 35th, 36th, 37th, 38th, and 39th Congressional Districts respectively. They requested this analysis in order to estimate the impact of the termination of federal unemployment benefits in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area. The analysis is based upon state and metropolitan area data on the number of unemployed workers and statewide estimates of the number of unemployed workers who will lose benefits.

FINDINGS

Unemployment in the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metro Area

Data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that there are 1,137,800 unemployed workers in California. Of these 1,137,800 unemployed workers, 292,400 are in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area.¹⁵ The statewide unemployment rate is 6.5%, and the unemployment rate in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area is 6.1%.¹⁶

¹³ Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, *More than One Million of the Unemployed Have Now Been Denied Aid Due to End of Federal Program* (Mar. 25, 2004).

¹⁴ Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, *Unmet Need Hits Record Level for the Unemployed* (Feb. 2, 2004).

¹⁵ Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Civilian Labor Force and Unemployment by State and Metro Area* (Feb. 2004) (online at <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/metro.t01.htm>).

¹⁶ *Id.*

Statewide, there are 517,969 individuals currently receiving unemployment insurance benefits in California.¹⁷ This analysis estimates that 124,700 of these unemployed workers are in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area.¹⁸ The average unemployment insurance benefit in California is \$253 per week.¹⁹

The Impact of the Expiration of Unemployment Insurance Benefits in the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metro Area

The date on which unemployed workers lose their unemployment benefits depends on how long the workers have been out of work.

In the first three months of 2004, more than one million unemployed workers in the United States exhausted their unemployment benefits. Using Department of Labor data, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that 176,700 workers in California lost unemployment insurance from late December through the end of March 2004.²⁰ An estimated 46,700 of these workers are in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area.²¹

If an extension of the unemployment insurance program is not revived, analysts have estimated that an average of 12,090 California workers will lose unemployment benefits each week in the first six months of 2004. In total, between January 1 and June 31, 2004, an estimated 314,344 workers in the state will lose unemployment benefits.²² An estimated 83,100 of these workers are in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area.²³

¹⁷ Department of Labor, *Unemployment Insurance Weekly Claims Report* (Feb. 28, 2004) (online at <http://atlas.doleta.gov/unemploy/page8/2004/022804.html>).

¹⁸ Bureau of Labor Statistics data indicates that 26% of all unemployed workers in the state are in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area. This analysis estimates that 26% of the individuals in the state receiving unemployment insurance benefits are also in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area.

¹⁹ Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, *supra* note 13

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ This analysis estimates that 26% of all individuals losing unemployment insurance benefits are in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area. *See* note 18.

²² Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, *supra* note 14.

²³ This analysis estimates that 26% of all individuals losing unemployment insurance benefits are in the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area. *See* note 18.

Lost Economic Stimulus in the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metro Area from the Failure to Extend Unemployment Benefits

Because extended unemployment benefits are paid to workers who are in immediate need, these benefits are spent rapidly and provide a significant economic stimulus for communities. A February 2003 analysis estimated that every dollar paid in extended unemployment benefits boosts economic output by \$1.73.²⁴

If Congress extends the TEUC program to provide unemployment benefits for 13 additional weeks, workers in California will receive up to \$1.03 billion in unemployment benefits between January 1, 2004, and June 31, 2004. This would result in a stimulus to the statewide economy of up to \$1.78 billion.²⁵ In the Los Angeles-Long Beach metro area, workers would receive up to approximately \$273 million in unemployment benefits between January 1 and June 31, 2004.²⁶ This would result in a stimulus to the local economy of up to \$472 million.

²⁴ Economy.com, *Fiscal Stimulus*, Regional Economic Review, 14 (Feb. 2003). These funds are spent rapidly and cycle throughout the economy, causing a ripple effect that increases dollar-for-dollar GDP growth by more than the original expenditure.

²⁵ This estimate assumes that each of the 314,344 workers receives the average statewide benefit (\$253) for 13 weeks.

²⁶ This estimate assumes that each unemployed worker in the area receives the average statewide benefit for 13 weeks.